

REMARKS

Claims 1-20, 22-41 and 48-63 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 17, 22, and 23 being independent. New claims 60-63 have been added. Support for the new claims may be found in the application at least at page 17, lines 17-23 and page 18, line 24 to page 19, line 4. No new matter has been added.

Independent claims 1, 17, 22 and 23, along with their dependent claims 2-16, 18-20, 24-41 and 48-59, have been rejected as being anticipated by Stasnick (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,264). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Each of independent claims 1, 17 and 22 recites, among other features, “at the client, simultaneously executing/execute multiple instantiations of the browser application in response to the electronic data received from the host” (emphasis added). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 17 and 22, and their dependent claims, because Stasnick does not describe or suggest this feature.

Stasnick describes a multiple-browser application 402 that allows a user to access and interact with multiple applications, including browser applications, using a single integrated user interface (col. 7, lines 18-39). The multiple-browser application 402 may interact with a network operations center 150 or with a proxy server within a local area network 120 to manage multiple browsers and applications accessed by the user (col. 6, lines 32-37). Upon a user signing on to Stasnick’s system, client configuration settings, which indicate the applications that the user is allowed to access or denied access, are loaded into client configuration RAM 404 of the client 160 (col. 8, lines 49-57).

After the user signs on and the client configuration is set, the multiple-browser application 402 waits for user input before launching any applications (col. 8, lines 65-67). Only upon a user requesting that an application be launched through interactions with GUI 500 does the multiple-browser application 402 launch an application (col. 8, line 66 to col. 9, line 7 and col. 9, lines 13-16). Accordingly, Stasnick does not describe or suggest that multiple instantiations of a browser application are executed simultaneously in response to electronic data received from a host, as claimed. Rather, as shown in Fig. 6, Stasnick describes applications

being launched by the multiple-browser application 402 sequentially and in response to user requests, not simultaneously and in response to data received from a host.

For at least this reason, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 17 and 22, and their dependent claims 2-16, 18-20, 24-41, 48-53, and 56-58.

Independent claim 23 recites, among other features, “transmitting electronic data from the host in response to a data request received from the client, wherein the electronic data comprises instructions for simultaneously executing multiple instantiations of the browser application” (emphasis added). For at least the reasons described above, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 and its dependent claims 54, 55 and 59.

Applicants do not acquiesce in the Examiner’s characterizations of the art. For brevity and to advance prosecution, however, applicants may have not addressed all characterizations of the art and reserve the right to do so in further prosecution of this or a subsequent application. The absence of an explicit response by the applicants to any of the examiner's positions does not constitute a concession of the examiner's positions. The fact that applicant's comments have focused on particular arguments does not constitute a concession that there are not other arguments for patentability of the claims. All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons given with respect to the claims on which they depend.

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant : Dave Corboy et al.
Serial No. : 09/842,796
Filed : April 27, 2001
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-094001 / Brower 02

The fee in the amount of \$120 in payment for the Petition for Extension of Time fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Date: 8/7/06

Respectfully submitted,



Roberto J. Devoto
Reg. No. 55,108

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40359991.doc